

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/538,084	Applicant(s) WALTHER ET AL.	
	Examiner Gary K. Graham	Art Unit 3727	

All Participants:

(1) Gary K. Graham.

(2) Matthew R. Jenkins.

Date of Interview: 29 July 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

1,2,4,6,7,10,11 and 23

Prior art documents discussed:

Ostrowski (German 10011842)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Gary K. Graham/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3727

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner proposed particular amendments to the claims to clarify the distinction between the claimed subject matter and the Ostrowski reference in light of applicant's arguments. Also, the examiner proposed cancellation of particular dependent claims as such were directed to subject matter already defined in claim 1. The examiner suggested particular amendments to claim 1 to make clear that the support frame is a part of the wiper drive. Also set forth in claim 1 was that the at least one stop is of unitary, one piece construction with the detachable add-on element and that the tubular element is secured within the housing by the tube retaining section of the detachable add-on element or that the tubular element is secured by clamping between the housing and tube retaining section. The later being presented in a new claim 23 conforming to claim 1 save for this difference. Such particular structure with relation to the tubular element does not appear fairly taught by the art of record. See the Examiner's Amendment.